

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-31 are pending, in which claims 21, 26 and 28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 16-18, 20, 23-25, 27 and 29-31 are currently amended. No new matter is introduced.

The Final Office Action mailed January 22, 2010 rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, 17, 18, 23, 24 and 30 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* (US 2002/0082044) in view of *Britt et al.* (US 6,424,832, *Britt* hereinafter) and *Berkowitz et al.* (US 7,133,678, *Berkowitz* hereinafter), claims 25, 27 and 29 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Denisson* in view of *Moon* (US 7,295,844) and further in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz*, claims 10-12, 15 and 19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz* and further in view of *Denisson*, claims 3, 10, 13, 14, 20 and 22 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz* and further in view of *Silver* (US 7,162,237), claim 16 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz* and further in view of *Denisson* and *Silver*, and claim 31 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Dougherty* (US 6,831,902) and further in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz*.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

With respect to obviousness rejection of claims 1-22, to reduce issues for potential appeal, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 23-25 and 29-31. In particular, amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “wherein the location dependent routing information includes a local call-in number for performing two-stage dialing to establish the connection via a first access point of a first communication network accessible using the local call-in number, and wherein routing is to the other terminal in a second communication network

using a second access point of the second communication network via a third communication network comprising an internal communication network of the terminal and the other terminal.”

Amended independent claims 23-25 and 29-31 include similar features in a varying scope.

The Office Action states, “*Britt* discloses wherein said location dependent routing information includes local call-in numbers and parameters for performing two-stage dialing for establishing said connection via an access point of a first communication network accessible at said location of the at least one mobile terminal using a local call-in number for said access point wherein said routing is to the at least one other terminal in a second communication network (see col. 2, line 44- col. 3, line 4).” See page 4 of the Office Action. *Britt* discloses that roamer port numbers utilize tow-stage dialing procedures to enable subscribers operating in the same local network to call each other without incurring long distance charges (see col. 2, lines 46-51 of *Britt*). Thus, in *Britt*, the calls are made by subscribers operating within a single network. On the contrary, in the claimed invention, one terminal utilizes the first access point for connection to the first communication network and the other terminal utilizes the second access point for connection to the second communication network, and thus the claimed invention involves two different communication networks for communication between two terminals. Because the terminals in the claimed invention use different networks to communicate, the terminals in the claimed invention do not operate within the same local network, unlike the features disclosed in *Britt* (see also paragraph [0074] of the present application). Therefore, *Britt* fails to teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Further, the other cited references do not overcome these deficiencies of *Britt*.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 23-25 and 29-31, and each of the claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

April 22, 2010
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

Jun S. Ha
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 58508

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9951
Fax (703) 519-9958